DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 689 HE 009 604

AUTHOR Goodwin, Harold I., Ed.
TITLE Faculty Evaluation: Part 1. Collective Bargaining Perspectives, Volume 3, Number 1.
INSTITUTION West Virginia Univ., Morgantown. Dept. of Educational Administration.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 5p.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Educational Administration, College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Contracts; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; *Negotiation Agreements; Performance Contracts; Performance Criteria

ABSTRACT

Statements on faculty evaluation contained in higher education collective bargaining agreements may simply be a new ritual. It is difficult to read the agreement materials without concluding that they do not preclude a wide latitude of interpretation. Statements of standards against which to make uniform or equitable judgments do not exist. In part this may be related to a previous observation that, having demanded specific criteria against which to make evaluative judgments, unions reject the evaluation conclusions if they do not agree with them. Since judgments on salary, promotions, tenure, dismissal, and retrenchment are crucial to the faculty and to the quality of the institution, the present objective state of faculty evaluation is regarded as inadequate. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PERSPECTIVES

Department of Education Administration

College of Human Resources and Education
West Virginia University

Volume 3 Number 1 January 1978

Harold I. Goodwin, Editor

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

West Va. Univ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Faculty Evaluation: Part 1

Harold I. Goodwin
Professor of Higher Education
College of Human Resources and Education
West Virginia University

The collective bargaining issue under consideration in this issue of *Perspectives* is faculty evaluation. About 25 percent of the Agreements contain faculty evaluation as a specific topic. Most Agreements contain less direct evaluation requirements, usually rather oblique references attached to Agreement material on promotion, tenure, and retrenchment. It is to the former category, the specific faculty evaluation Agreement sections, that this issue is addressed.

The substance of agreement materials can be "cut" several different ways. One set of themes that appears to underlie evaluation material revolves around performance accountability, the imperfection of measurement, and job security. Attached to this theme is the associated stress on the avoidance of the usual rituals, protocols, and conventions that dominated faculty assessment before faculty unionism.

PURPOSES

Faculty evaluation statements, when viewed collectively in the pool of Agreements, address in their sections on the purposes of evaluation standards, instruction, faculty development, and job status.

Standards

The concern over standards is well expressed in this Agreement passage: "The evaluation of the professional activities of all employees in a public institution of higher education is essential to the maintenance of academic and professional standards of excellence."

Instruction

Agreement purpose statements with regard to the instruction or teaching element of the traditional teaching, research, and service trilogy are minor variations of the simple theme "for the purpose of improving instruction." Among the variations we find: (1) To seek methods for the improvement of instruction; (2) Effective and purposeful instruction and guidance; (3) Improvement of teaching and the enhancement of learning; and (4) To improve the quality of teaching/service performed by the faculty and is not designed to be used as a punitive measure.

Faculty development

The most common statement simply indicates the need for the improvement of individual professional performance. Other areas under the topic of faculty development include the identification of specific strengths and weaknesses, and the development of procedures for correcting those weaknesses; evaluating the progress and success of both the newly employed and experienced personnel; and to help identify individual and inservice training requirements.

There were no direct references to research or publications in statements of the purposes of faculty evaluation and only one oblique reference to service. As far as statements of purpose go, instruction was the main concern, closely followed by faculty status.

Faculty status

The term status as used here is not related to achievement and recognition. The common thread that runs through statements of purpose most frequently opens with the improvement of instruction and concludes with a reference to the use of evaluations as a basis to judge whether or not an individual faculty member should be reappointed, promoted, granted tenure, removed from probationary status, or dismissed.

OBJECTIVES

A minority of Agreements tie in with their statement of purposes additional material on objectives. Objectives may be related to previous evaluations, as this passage notes: "The Faculty Member, in preparing the statement of objectives, shall take into consideration strengths and weaknesses identified in the faculty members report for the proceding year."

The objectives may be stated in terms of the college's goals and planning processes, as this passage illustrates:

> To develop and maintain accountability each Faculty Member shall annually develop a statement of objectives. Such objectives shall relate to the particular responsibilities of the Faculty Member, to the relevant goals of the College and to the College's planning process.

An individual's objectives may be required to fall within a prescribed set of evaluative criteria. For instance:

> Evaluative criteria may be viewed as parameters which define the institutional role of a faculty member. Therefore, objectives set by the faculty member as a basis for his evaluation should be structured so as to lend themselves to assessment using

HE009604

these criterion. Conversely, any one criterion might be satisfied by more than one objective.

In some instances there is the requirement of measurability, as in this example:

> Those measurable objectives which can be verified within a specified time period under defined conditions, and which shall include the methods for substantiating the extent of achievement, such as type of data to be collected, sources of evaluative information, evaluation instrument to be employed, and performance standards expected.

The same institution, recognizing the inability to obtain measurements related to all legitimate objectives, also specified as a type of objectives the following:

> Those objectives where accomplishment of an ultimate goal cannot be verified within a given time period but for which a number of steps and activities leading toward the goal can be listed such as activities in the community and involvement in college services and college governance.

The statement of the faculty member's objectives may not be entirely of the faculty member's own choosing. The administration may hold the right of intervention in one of three forms. An instructor may be required to develop a statement of objectives in cooperation with the appropriate administrator. Next, once having written the objectives, the faculty member's statement of objectives may be amended with the approval of the appropriate administrator. Finally, with his set of objectives written, an administrator may approve, modify, or disapprove them.

It is not often stated, but here and there among institutions a faculty member is required to distribute copies of the objectives both to the faculty member's students and colleagues, and the statements become "part of the teaching competency evaluation instrument."

CRITERIA

The issue in faculty evaluation that draws the greatest attention is the specification of the criteria against which evaluation will be made. Institutions vary greatly in the types and amounts of criteria contained in their Agreements. To illustrate the variances there follows a selection of seven examples.

Example No. 1

Evaluation will be in accord with the standards and procedures adopted by the Administration.

Example No. 2

An evaluation of professional activities shall be based on total professional performance.

Example No. 3

The faculty member shall be advised, in writing, of the criteria to be used in the evaluation.

Example No. 4

The criteria for evaluation shall include effectiveness in teaching or contributions to professional service and two of the following: student services, college service or governance, community services, and professional development.

Example No. 5

Criteria of evaluation shall include but not be limited to teaching effectiveness, academic credentials, professional activities, professional development, research, publications, work for the college, sponsorship of student organizations and/or cocurricular activities, professional performances and/or exhibitions, professional grants and/or awards, community activities related to one's professional duties at the college, and all-college and academic committee work.

Example No. 6

The criteria for evaluating employees shall be based upon their assigned duties, in terms, where applicable, of:

(A) Teaching effectiveness, including effectiveness in presenting knowledge, information, and ideas by means or methods such as lecture, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, laboratory exercise, practical experience, and direct consultation with students. The evaluation shall include consideration of effectiveness in stimulating the students' critical thinking and/or creative abilities, and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students.

(B) Contribution to the discovery of new knowledge, development of new educational techniques, and other forms of creative activity. Evidence of research and other creative activity shall include, but not be limited to, published books; articles and papers in professional journals; musical compositions, paintings, scultpure; works of performing art; papers presented at meetings of professional societies; and current research and creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication, display, or performance. The evaluation shall include consideration of the employee's productivity, including the quality and quantity of what has been done during the year, and of the employee's long-term research and other creative programs and contributions; and recognition by the academic or professional community of what is done.

(C) Service on departmental, college, and university committees, councils, and senates; service in appropriate professional organizations; participation in meetings, symposia, conferences, workshops; participation in radio and television; and service on local, state, and national governmental boards, agencies, and commissions. Evaluation of service shall include consideration of contribution to:
  (1) The orderly and effective functioning of the employee's academic unit (program, department, school, college) and/or the total university.
  (2) The university community; and
  (3) The local, state, regional, and national communities, and scholarly and professional associations.

(D) Other assigned university duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, and other professional activity.

(E) Such other criteria as may be appropriate to the assignments.

Example No. 7

I. Instructional Responsibilities:
  (A) Instructional Performance—Preparation
    (1) Develops clearly defined and appropriate goals.

(2) Uses appropriate diagnostic procedures and instruments to ascertain student needs.
(3) Strives to identify in performance terms the cognitive and/or affective objectives which students are to achieve in each learning sequence and the conditions under which they are to demonstrate the degree to which they have attained these objectives.
(4) Selects content and organizes course so as to demonstrate a specific knowledge of subject matter as well as an understanding of the principles of continuity, sequence, and integration.
(5) Develops and/or uses instructional strategies which enable students to achieve specific learning objectives.
(6) Provides for alternative methods of instruction to meet the needs of different students.
(7) Is aware of and selects learning resources and environment provided by the college.
(8) Attempts to develop interdisciplinary experiences for students. (Relates learning materials to that of other courses, etc.)

(B) Instructional Performance—Implementation
(1) Shows concern for the academic welfare of students, (e.g., endeavors to motivate students to achieve learning objectives).
(2) Communicates effectively at level appropriate to the ability of students to understand and assimilate.
(3) Prepares thoroughly for each learning activity.
(4) Maintains an atmosphere conducive to the learning situation (e.g., avoids and/or curtails inappropriate student or teacher behavior).
(5) Fosters an atmosphere of respect in relationships with students.

(C) Instructional Performance—Evaluation of Results of Instruction
(1) Uses appropriate evaluative instruments which effectively measure the degree to which the student has achieved the goals and objectives of the learning sequence.
(2) Is fair and reasonably prompt in evaluating student performance.
(3) Establishes clearly defined grading procedures and standards in accordance with the grading policy of the college.
(4) Collects and uses feedback from experience with students to revise and update content, objectives, and instructional strategies.

II. Responsibilities as a Member of the College Community:
(A) Effectively serves on and/or chairs divisional and college-wide committees.
(B) Assumes divisional responsibilities.
(C) Uses his/her professional skills and abilities in community affairs.
(D) Properly and promptly performs routine administrative duties (reports, forms, grades, etc.).
(E) Accepts responsibilities for performing institutional tasks beyond normal assignments, (e.g., organizes and conducts conferences, prepares funding proposals, acts as advisor to student groups and clubs, etc.).
(F) If assigned student advisees, competently performs duties as outlined in the *Faculty Advisor's Handbook*.
(G) Is punctual and consistent in attending scheduled meetings with students (class, laboratories, office hours, appointments, etc.)
(H) Shows evidence of professional growth by at least one of the following activities:
(1) Relevant advanced study.
(2) Activity in local, state, and national professional organizations.
(3) Participation in independent study and workshops, inservice training, seminars, conferences, etc.
(4) External publications.
(5) Other.

Additional criteria

There are many other alternatives on which evaluation occurs. The following list was culled from the remaining Agreements in our files: Ability to create conditions favorable to self-guided learning; academic advisement; academic degrees received; active participation in departmental evaluation of course offerings and curricula for the purpose of maintaining their quality, relevance and viability; administrative assignments; attainment of stated goals and objectives of individual courses and academic programs; availability as a resource person; availability to students; book publications funded by governmental agencies, professional associations, and acknowledged professional publishing houses; publications in recognized professional and/or academic journals; capability of facilitating learning; class load in terms of numbers and diversity; classroom effectiveness; community relationships; continued improvement of methods and procedures of classroom presentation; contributions to planning; conscientious discharging of responsibilities for student advisement; course and classroom organization; course and curricula development; degrees earned in the field of specialization; departmental, college, and university assignments; development, improvement, and demonstration of subject matter; development of class materials and innovations; enthusiasm and ability to stimulate; evaluation by students; experience; fairness and adequacy of grading and evaluation procedures; graduate study; honors and awards; instructional ability and performance of a level worthy of the high standards expected of college teaching; interest and participation in the development of good relations with students as individuals and as organized groups; journal editor or consultant to professional periodicals and organizations; judgment by colleagues; keep abreast of current developments in his/her field; knowledge of subject matter; length of service to the college; memberships in professional and honor societies; post-doctoral study in an accredited college or university or in recognized institutes of advanced study; preparation and appropriate methods of presentation; previous teaching experience; professional ability and performance; professional activities contributing to the good of the university which are not required of faculty members as matters of regular assignment, such as service on college or university-wide committees, service on professional boards or accreditation agencies as a representative of the university; service on such task forces of the university as are, from time to time, established by the president and/or the board of trustees; professional attitude and awareness; professional certifications; professional experience, both academic and otherwise; professional growth and standards; promptness and efficient use of class time; punctuality and class attendance; recognition by learned

societies or professional associations for demonstrated achievement or leadership at a substantial level beyond the university community and in an academic or professional area; reputation in the subject-matter field; research funded by governmental agencies and professional associations and/or publicly acknowledged by learned and professional societies; significant professional activities contributing to the good of the public sector which are associated with the faculty member's area of academic or professional expertise and which are rendered without remuneration; student guidance; training; willingness to answer questions and help students; and working relations with peers.

Authorization

A different order of criteria related to statements of evaluation deals with the authorization to develop the criteria on which evaluation will hinge. The authorizations are located in programs, departments, colleges and committees, as these Agreement passages show.

Example No. 1

Each program unit shall prepare the necessary evaluation instruments to assess teacher competency in that area. The Evaluation Committee shall review and, if necessary, revise such instruments for the purpose of maintaining as much standardization as feasible.

Example No. 2

Each department will devise the forms and methods it uses in peer, student, and self evaluation.

Example No. 3

The college will consult with the union after developing and prior to using a written evaluation instrument. This shall in no way impair the college's right to utilize whatever methods it deems necessary with the proviso that all items used in an evaluation will be placed in the unit member's file.

Example No. 4

The committee shall develop an instrument to evaluate the faculty member's contribution in non-teaching areas. These will include such areas as professional development, additional contributions to the college, to the community, and to professional organizations. The college shall recognize that it is not necessary for a faculty member to show full participation in all non-teaching areas.

A committee consisting of the academic vice president, academic dean, assistant dean or director, and three (3) faculty members designated by the federation shall determine the criteria for these evaluations.

SUMMARY

Statements on faculty evaluation in higher education collective bargaining Agreements, at least as seen here in Part I, simply may be a new ritual, a different prescribed form or manner governing the actions of a ceremony. It is difficult to read the Agreement materials without concluding that they do not preclude a wide latitude of interpretation. Statements of standards against which to make uniform or equitable judgments do not exist. Judgments of faculty performance made by administrators, given no further Agreement specificness or measurability, most likely are norm-referenced rather than criteria-referenced. Except for the certain rather mechanistic alterations in the new rites of passage, the final judgment may not set administrator judgments about promotions, etc., on any firmer, fairer, or objective grounds than previously has been the case. Judgments may "look" more equitable, but they may not actually be so.

In part this may be related to the Kemerer and Baldridge observation that having demanded specific criteria against which to make evaluative judgments, unions reject the evaluation conclusions if they do not agree with then . Lacking either *effective* norm-referenced and/or criteria-referenced bases, it is difficult to judge what the accumulation of "evidence" really means. Since judgments on salary, promotions, tenure, retrenchment, and dismissal are crucial to the faculty, and to the quality of the institution, the present objective state of faculty evaluation is regarded as inadequate.